

Teleconference Meeting Summary

2/3/05

MEETING OVERVIEW

OPMP hosted an ACMP District teleconference at 9 AM on Thursday, February 3, 2005. The purpose of the teleconference was to communicate with coastal districts, consultants, and other interested participants about the status of the ACMP given the recent letter from OCRM.

There was no formal agenda for the meeting.

OCRM Letter

Randy acknowledged that OPMP received OCRM's letter on Friday, January 28, 2005. The letter was posted on the ACMP website on Monday, January 31st and is available to all. OPMP is still reviewing the letter, evaluating the content and issues presented by OCRM, and discussing internally the options for moving forward. There was no discussion on content of the OCRM letter at the teleconference. OPMP staff will be meeting with the Governor's Office this afternoon to discuss the letter and options for the State's response.

Adequately Addressed Issue

Randy mentioned that the text clarifying the "adequately addressed" issue was submitted to OCRM on December 16, 2004, and has been posted on the ACMP website at <http://www.alaskacoast.state.ak.us/OCRM/Subsections5-3-3-5-3-6.pdf>.

Plan Amendment Schedule

OPMP staff advised that districts should continue to work on the plan amendments and proceed as scheduled to comply with the July 1, 2005, deadline. OPMP is continuing to develop more tools that will help the districts and consultants with their plan amendments. Right now OPMP staff is developing a Public Review Draft Cover Letter and Public Notice. They are also working on a checklist that highlights minimum requirements for the plan amendment transition process. As soon as they are finalized, they will be posted on the District Planner's Web Page and an email notice will be sent out to everyone.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

No questions were raised that weren't answered in the teleconference.

WHAT TO EXPECT

Information from OPMP on how the State will respond to OCRM's letter.

Email when additional plan amendment tools are available on the District Planner's Web Page.

Teleconference Meeting Summary

1/05/05

MEETING OVERVIEW

OPMP hosted an ACMP District teleconference at 9 AM on Wednesday, January 5, 2005. The purpose of the teleconference was to further address *Responses to Questions Posed at the District Workshop 10/20-10/22 2004*.

Within that context, OPMP discussed a new tool for guiding the development of district enforceable policies. The District Enforceable Policy (DEP) Decision Tree is now available on the web at:

<http://www.alaskacoast.state.ak.us/Plans/intro.htm>

Within the Decision Tree, step #7 refers to the concept of "adequately addressed". This concept was discussed in light of the current interpretation as stated in step #7. This clarifies previous guidance regarding "adequately addressed" as presented in the program amendment at 5.3.3 and in the Responses to Questions posed at the ACMP Coastal District Workshop, Question 4. Written guidance on "adequately addressed" will be forthcoming.

Kerry Howard, OHMP director, provided information regarding the geographic extent of OHMP's authority to manage fish habitat. Summarily, OHMP's authority is rooted in AS 41.14.840 and 870, which covers anadromous and resident fish habitat from stream bank to stream bank, below ordinary high water. The Habitat Standard at 11 AAC 112.300 extends OHMP's authority under the ACMP to address management within the specific riparian management areas as defined at 11 AAC 112.300(c) (2).

Coastal districts and consultants expressed their concern with being able to write enforceable policies and identify the boundaries for designated areas with six months to go and the guidance on how to write enforceable policies is still evolving.

OPMP prepared example enforceable policies for the October workshop, and will revisit those to see if any changes are necessary, given the interpretation of "adequately addressed" and the limits on designating areas on federal lands. Also, OPMP has been working on revising the sample enforceable policies prepared when HB 191 was before the legislature. Those enforceable policies are being revised to comply with the ACMP regulations adopted in 2004.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:

1. What policies can a district write for OCS activities?
2. How can a district write erosion control policies if DEC and the COE address erosion? Would they be allowed under the natural hazards designated areas?

WHAT TO EXPECT:

1. Written clarification of the adequacy issue
2. Sample District Enforceable Policies from the workshop
3. Sample District Enforceable Policies, from HB 191
4. Graphic representation of the DEP Decision Tree
5. Report on designations, AMSAs and SAMPs on federal land discussion with OCRM
6. How to write enforceable policies to specify whether or not activities are allowed within designated areas, AMSAs or SAMPs
7. What erosion control enforceable policies a coastal district could potentially write

District Teleconference
July 27, 2004
2:00 pm – 3:30 pm

AGENDA:

1. Introduction

Attendees: Marv Smith, Karol K., Jerry Medina, Susan Lee, Laura Hastings (DEC), Julie Hammonds, Gordon Brower, Johnny Aikens, Waska (NSB), Steve Hanis, Katharine Heumann, Jim Dory, Ellen Ferguson, Teri Camery, Marlene Campbell, Wells Williams (Sitka), Scott Hansen, Gabrielle LaRoche, Jan Caulfield, Eileen Bechtold, Gina Shirey-Potts, Peter McKay, Sara Hunt, Sylvia Kreel, Chas Dense, John Gliva, Sally Cox

2. Plan Amendment Grant Application: Points of clarification

- Budget: If you are asking for more than \$50K, be prepared to talk about priorities. Either include them in your evaluation or be prepared to talk about it during the next week. We are scheduled to review grants as a group August 9 and 10.
- Rating Criteria: Are we supposed to do something narrative about the Rating Criteria? Or is this just a statement of how the application will be analyzed? NO, the criteria is there just for your information.

3. Plan Amendment Format

The format for the plan amendment was discussed a bit last week. It was discussed again internally after some points were raised at the last teleconference. For the plan amendment submission, it will still be required to be a whole document in electronic format submitted on a CD. The main reason for this requirement is for the ease of use for all parties including the district and state and federal agencies. State agencies, the public, and the DNR commissioner's office will be reviewing all of the plans in a compressed timeframe, and they must be able to efficiently locate and review all of the information in the plan and how it relates to the enforceable policies. OPMP will scan plans that are not in electronic format, targeted for completion by August 30. The plans will be scanned as MS Word documents with optical character recognition (OCR) so the coastal districts can edit them. Please address this step in your budget.

For the mapping portion, we are trying to keep it as simple as possible. We have developed some guidelines and emailed the draft guidelines to everyone. Basically no new maps will have to be created if existing maps are at a sufficient scaled to be used. It is important to note that while a line can be drawn on an existing map, it is critical for the scale of the map to be such that an applicant or anyone else will be able to tell if a project is **in or out** of the designated area. These maps, though, will have to be scanned into a pdf file. If existing GIS maps are used or new GIS maps are created with ACMP/ CIAP grant money, then they will have to conform to the GIS protocols.

4. Open discussion and questions on Plan Evaluation and grant application.

Question: My coastal district did some extensive subsistence mapping not too long ago. Some of the subsistence areas are outside of my district's coastal zone boundary. Do designated areas have to be within the district's coastal zone boundary?

Answer: Yes, designated areas have to be within a district's coastal zone boundary.

Question: Do all maps have to be imbedded as pdfs in the plan amendment document? Our district has a lot of maps, some large, and it would take a lot of time and know-how to do that.

Answer: No, the large maps do not have to be included in the plan amendment. A smaller, compressed version of the maps can be used in the plan amendment for designated areas and refer the reader to the larger, detailed maps. That map can be included at the end of the plan amendment or in a separate file of maps. All maps must be clearly labeled.

Question: Is there an option for using Adobe Acrobat files so that the narrative and maps are all in one file? A linked Adobe file would be easier for reviewers to navigate.

Answer: Yes, but we still would require the plan as a Word document as well. The Word document has to be created first before it's converted into Adobe so there's the possibility of having both and allowing the reviewers to choose which version to view.

Question: How can we accomplish all the mapping and the plan amendments with the limited funds?

Answer: The mapping guidelines were developed with the intent of making the task easy and affordable. For example, a designated area could be mapped by taking an existing USGS topographic map, and drawing the line around the designated area, and typing on the legend information. You can then scan that map and save it as a pdf. The maps will have to meet the criteria in the regulations and the mapping guidelines (for example, be at a scale large enough to determine whether a project is inside or outside of the designated area).

Also, for your coastal district boundary maps, you can reference the Coastal Zone Boundary Atlas Maps of Alaska (available electronically on OPMP's website) in your plan. You will need to include, as a pdf, an 8 1/2 x 11 pdf version of the district boundary in the plan. See the Mapping guidelines.

Question: Can I submit the travel information for the plan amendment budget as an Excel file?

Answer: Yes, that level of detail would be helpful.

Question: When will we know how much plan amendment money we will receive?

Answer: We anticipate announcing the award amounts by mid-August. You could start your rfp process then. In the meantime, you could have your rfp drafted, so you are ready to send it out when the amount is announced.

District Teleconference

July 7, 2004

Attendees: Katharine Heumann, Sara Hunt, Gina Shirey-Potts, Sylvia Kreel, Sally Cox, Jan Caulfield, Gabrielle LaRoche, Julie Hammonds, Carol Smith, Brian Templin, Skip Ryman, April Jensen, Marlene Campbell, Ellen Ferguson, Glenn Gray, Marj Harris, Michelle C., Teri Camery, Johnny (NSB), Marv Smith, Steve Hanis

Agenda

1. Valdez Plan Tables- shows process and why certain policies can't be retained. Helpful for planning commission.
2. Minutes from June 17, 2004 teleconference on the District Planner's Work Page on web.
3. FAQs on District's Planner's Webpage. Organized according to subject. Currently 6 topics including Boundary, GIS Protocols, Enforceable Policies and Designated Areas, Plan Amendment Grant Application and Plan Evaluation, Plan Amendment, and Implementation Chapter. Questions discussed during the last several teleconferences have been included in the FAQs and are therefore not included in the minutes from the teleconference.
4. Discussion/Questions:

Habitat policies

There was discussion about the need to address the special productivity of the habitat when writing habitat policies in accordance with 11 AAC 112.300(b)(9).

Example:

If you want to protect eel grass beds you have to designate certain areas as important habitat. The resource inventory and analysis needs to discuss the importance of eel grass beds within the designated areas. The policy could say "you shall avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to eel grass beds in designated important habitat area as shown on the map XX." You need to use avoid, minimize, and mitigate sequence. You can't be more restrictive than what's already been provided for. It is the District's job to identify important habitat areas. However, OHMP will get deference as far as habitat issues are concerned.

Julie Hammonds noted that the sample policy doesn't add anything to 112(b)(9) and asked for more examples.

Jan: Can a district restrict specific activities? – It seems that they can not do it since it's more restrictive. Example: can gravel extraction be prohibited in a certain area. Answer: OPMP will discuss this with the attorney, and we hope to have an answer by next teleconference.

Designated important habitat areas can include habitats addressed in the standards, such as estuaries, as well as other important habitats, such as eel grass beds.

Resolutions of support

Gabrielle: Do resolutions have to be included with grant application?

Answer: We need a signed resolution by the time the grant agreement is signed. We still want to see some support for the grant beyond the coastal coordinator with the grant application (address this in question #4 in application) even if informal. Note when formal approval would be received.

Plan Amendment

Marlene: In what format will DNR/OPMP want the 7/1/05 submission (complete document or just amended portion)?

Answer: We will have to get back on this one.

Marlene: Is there going to be a template for the 7/1 submission? Do we have to do full public process with PHD and CAD?

Answer: 11 AAC 114.345 outlines transition process. The process is faster and more curtailed than the regular amendment process. There is reduced public review. The required milestones and products are on the grant application (#4 and 5). They come from the regulations. Also, DNR/OPMP has drafted a flowchart with some deadlines. This will be on webpage next week.

Mariculture policies

Julie- Sitka has a lot of mariculture policies: Can districts regulate mariculture? If so, under what authority? Through fish & seafood processing? How restrictive can these policies be?

Gabrielle: KTN had policies on goeducks. DNR said that they regulated it. KTN's policies were deemed redundant. Are there areas that may not be redundant?

Policies

Jan: There are places where there are considerations that a local coastal district has expertise. For example, F&G regs say you can't impact traditional fishery operations. It is an appropriate role for districts to talk about traditional fisheries. Another example: It is also appropriate for the district to have an opportunity to make sure mariculture is compatible with existing uses.

Gabrielle: Was told during KTN process that use conflicts are dealt with through habitat standard (112.300). The topic is off limits- because the state occupies the field.

Jan: Plan Evaluation is just an initial look at the plan. Final decisions about policies won't be made by 8/2. Will be made over next fiscal year.

Gabrielle: KTN plan went through the ringier. Was surprised by the limitations placed on habitat. Pretty strong answer on habitat for KTN. Districts can't have policies managing for competing uses since they are already covered by state standard.

Jan: When will lessons learned from KTN be available?

Gabrielle: KTN Plan Evaluation will be on the web. Gabrielle will include some of the information from the lessons learned.

Sylvia: Ketchikan's policies were reviewed by Bill, Randy, and Bruce. They will be forwarded higher up. When policies approved, they will be posted on the website. But it will show only what was approved. Will see how to include information on what wasn't approved.

Sara: If we have a policy that's been reviewed by the attorney, we can include it in the FAQs to track it.

Log transfer facilities (ltfs)

Julie: how can ltfs be addressed since they are timber-related?

Gabrielle: Previously some districts designated ltf sites. Could probably have a policy dealing with siting of ltfs through habitat, recreation, or subsistence where siting would be inappropriate because of that designation.

Sara: Ltfs could possibly be addressed under the transportation standard since they are about the transportation of goods from land to sea.

Sylvia: The Enforceable Policy Subject Guidance notes that they may be addressed under transportation or coastal development.

5. Next Teleconference

Next teleconference around 7/21. Will try to send out e-mail by the end of this week. Need more time to answer questions.

District Teleconference

June 24, 2004

The June 24th meeting was brief, and we basically talked about the following three questions. (These questions and answers are also found in the Frequently Asked Questions document.)

1. What would a policy have to include to meet the statutory requirement for policies to be clear and concise regarding “the persons affect by the policies”?

Answer: It would need to be clear how the policy is implemented, who implements, who enforces, and who has expertise in determining compliance with the policy. For example, if the policy requires a study be done, it must clarify when the study must be done and who does the study. It must also clarify to whose standard it must comply, or who has the authority to approve the study or find that it is sufficient. This is not a new requirement. The *Drafting Principals for Enforceable Policies*, published in 1997, includes this direction. Principal 4 states:

Identify responsible Parties and their responsibilities.

Intent

To avoid confusion during project review and implementation phases, policies should identify: 1) specific responsibilities of agencies or districts, where applicable.

Policies need to be clear on who has the burden of proof if there is a possibility of confusion or dispute regarding studies, data collection, impact evaluation, or policy implementation and enforcement.

2. How should the districts demonstrate that a resource or use of “unique” concern to them and where should this demonstration be made (resource analysis)?

Answer: Refer to 11 AAC 114.240 I and 11 AAC 114.270 (h)(1)(D). In order to include an enforceable policy that addresses a matter which is addressed by state or federal law, the district must document that the subject is a matter of local concern. This documentation has several criteria that must be met. One criterion is that the district show that the coastal use or resource is of **unique concern** to the coastal resource district as demonstrated by local usage or scientific evidence. This evidence must be documented in the resource analysis. “Local usage” and “scientific evidence” are defined in the regulations at 11 AAC 114.990 (23) and (40).

11 AAC 114.990 Definitions

- (23) “local usage” means current and actual use of a coastal resource by residents of the locality in which the resource is found;

- (40) “scientific evidence” means facts or data that are
- (A) premised upon established chemical, physical, biological, or ecosystem management principles as obtained through scientific method and submitted to the office to furnish proof of a matter required under this chapter;
 - (B) in a form that would allow resource agency review for scientific merit; and
- I supported by one or more of the following:
- (i) written analysis based on field observation and professional judgment along with photographic documentation;
 - (ii) written analysis from a professional scientist with expertise in the specific discipline; or
 - (iii) site-specific scientific research that may include peer-review level research or literature;

3. Clarify what effect, if any, the DEC ‘carve-out’ has on a district’s ability to have local enforceable policies that relate to air, land, and water quality?

Answer: As noted in the Enforceable Policy Subject Guidance, a district may not write enforceable policies on air, land, or water quality. However, there may be ways to affect such issues through other means, such as siting.

District Teleconference

June 17, 2004

Minutes

ATTENDEES: Sheldon Adams, Scott Hanson, Sylvia Kreel, Katharine Heumann, Sara Hunt, Gina Shirey-Potts, Karol Kolehmainen, Jerry Medina, Marv Smith, Susan Lee, Gabrielle LaRoche, Tina Anderson, Jim Dory, Julie Hammonds, Cynthia Zuelow-Osborne, Randy Bates, John Gliva, Steve Hanis, Teri Camery, Glenn Gray, Marj Harris, Michelle C., Eileen B., Michelle Sterns, Dan Bevington, Marlene Campbell, April Jensen, (additional attendees from the North Slope borough joined after introductions)

PURPOSE:

- Review Enforceable Policy Subject Guidance
- Walk you through a policy analysis

AGENDA:

1. Introduction:

- Who's on line
- Review ground rules
- Review purpose and agenda
- Future teleconferences

2. Review packet materials – emailed and available on web

- Enforceable Policy Subject Guidance
- Sample completed policy analysis worksheet
- Attachment D: Policy Analysis Worksheet key
- Attachment E: Policy Analysis Worksheet
- Regulations at 11 AAC 110, 112, 114 see:
<http://www.alaskacoast.state.ak.us>

3. How to use Enforceable Policy Subject Guidance: Review of chart:

It's important when you use the guidance chart that you have your regulations 11 AAC 110, 112 and 114 handy.

Enforceable Policy Subject Guidance:

1st column: lists subjects that enforceable policies can address.

- Lists 16 different subjects: some covered in standards 11 AAC 112, others covered in subject uses 114.250. Some addressed in both.

- Standards: applied to coastal zone regardless of district – applied both within district and coastal zone outside of districts.
- District enforceable policies only apply within district.
- District enforceable policies can address all of the subject uses but can not address all of the topics covered by the state standards.

2nd Column: shows the regulations applicable to each subject –

- Only references standard and subject use section –need to use regulations in conjunction with chart to see actual language.
- Provides definitions of some of the key terms you will need to understand each subject.
- A few definitions that are common to several subjects are included in the notes section at end.

3rd Column: notes where the state standard and enforceable policy is applicable for each subject.

- Some enforceable policies and standards are applicable throughout coastal area –district wide. ex: Energy facilities
- Some enforceable policies and standards apply to **coastal waters** only. Ex: coastal development. Need to refer to definitions in 2nd column under coastal development to see definition of coastal water to see limits of applicability.
- Some enforceable policies are applicable only in designated areas: ex: subsistence, recreation.
- Some, standards are applicable throughout coastal area – but the enforceable policy of the same subject is applicable only to designated areas. ex: natural hazards
- For those subjects that are applicable only to designated areas, the districts must designate such areas in the district plan. Ex: recreation use areas, tourism use areas.
- For some subjects DNR can designate areas during the consistency review process. Ex: natural hazard areas

4th Column: provides guidance for writing policies that is specific to each subject.

- 11AAC114.250 (b-i) includes specific guidance, such as criteria, that must be met. This guidance is included in the 4th column. Ex: tourism
- In addition to the guidance on this chart, enforceable policies still need to meet the regulations as far as being clear and concise, non duplicative, etc.
- If you are not planning on having any policies regarding a subject – than you do not need to designate areas.
- Some subjects you can not address through enforceable policies – also on chart. Ex: air, land and water quality and timber harvest and processing.

Example: Wetlands.

Column 3 clarifies that you need to look at the definition of wetlands in column 2 to determine applicability. That definition includes the terms “saltwater wetlands” and “freshwater wetlands”. You also need to look at all these definitions in column 2. Column 4 clarifies that in order to write policies about any of the habitat types, including wetlands, you need to designate the area as an “important habitat area”. The criteria to designate an area as an “important habitat area” are listed.

Justification for designating an area needs to be backed up in the resource inventory and analysis.

4. Review sample completed policy analysis worksheet

Use Attachment D and E from Packet 1, Plan evaluation- on web. Received in mail.

The policy analysis will help you write your evaluation and ultimately help you with your plan amendment. It will help you determine what needs to be done to each policy to comply with the new regulations. It will help you determine if the policy needs to be worded differently; or, if there are additional resources needed in the resource inventory and analysis to show something is a matter of local concern. Ultimately it will help you decide if it is worth the effort to fix a policy to meet the new regulations or if it should be deleted.

The following is an example that Gabrielle LaRoche did for Ketchikan. We will post additional examples on the web soon.

Ketchikan Gateway borough: CD-1

Clarifies what uses are considered water related and water dependant and some criteria to allow for non water related activities

Look at policy analysis worksheet KEY for questions.

Questions on worksheet:

1. Gets at the importance of the policy. Is it used frequently? Does it address a critical matter? If a policy has not been important in the past – you may choose to delete it rather than spend time on revising it.
2. Enforceable policies must flow from or relate to one of the subject uses that you can write policies about. Each subject you can write policies on is listed.
3. Does the policy adopt, duplicate, repeat, restate, paraphrase or incorporate by reference a state standard or other state or federal law? If so – then delete – or figure out a way to make the policy more specific so it addresses a matter of local concern and does not duplicate what is already being regulated on the State or federal level.

NOTE: 3rd bullet **CORRECTION:** cross off “skip to question 6”. Even if you answer “no” to Question 3, you still need to look at questions 4 and 5.

4. Does the policy address a subject matter regulated or authorized by state or federal law? No – while the policy, CD-1, generally addresses coastal development – and can therefore flow from coastal development standard– it provides greater specificity – something not addressed by state or federal law. Because we can make the argument that question 4 is “NO” – then we do not need to show that it is a matter of local concern. Can skip to question 6.
6. Looks at wording and language – is the policy clear and concise? Does it use precise, prescriptive and enforceable language? Is it clear who is responsible and what they are supposed to do?

CD-1: Answer: yes – existing wording is ok

7. Based on analysis in 1 -6 what changes need to be made?

CD-1: Answer: none

8. Is it worth it? CD-1: No changes are necessary – hence N/A

5. Review FAQs and other questions

Refer to FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions) posted on District Planner's Work Page for Questions and Answers discussed during teleconference. The FAQs are organized according to general topics and will be updated weekly.

District Planner's Work Page: <http://www.alaskacoast.state.ak.us/Plans/intro.htm>

Additional Comments:

Dan Bevington noted that habitat productivity is a national and regional priority. He noted that uplands and habitat productivity is a valid concern. He is trying to find a way to assure that development will not harm district priorities.

Teri Camery noted that it seems like streams draining into coastal waters should be sufficient documentation. She questioned why there was a need for a huge body of documentation?

The North Slope Borough expressed concern about the need to develop scientific evidence with limited funding.

Scott Hansen talked about the relationship of the Haines land use code to their coastal management plan. There was discussion about the ease of amending a local code relative to amending the coastal plan. It was noted that since NOAA has to approve district coastal plans and they become part of the State's program, local codes can't be incorporated by reference.

Teri Camery noted a similar issue in Juneau. She noted that there will be lots of policies eliminated under the changes and that one option is to keep the old program in the local ordinance and have a separate district coastal plan.

District Teleconference

June 9, 2004

ATTENDEES: Jim Dory, Karol K., Dan Bevington, Brian Templin, Ellen Ferguson, Teri Camery, Sara Hunt, Katharine Heumann, Sylvia Kreel, Gina Shirey-Potts, Michelle Sterns, Thede Tobish, Barbara Sheinberg, Marv Smith, Marj Harris, Michelle Calver, Kim Kruse, Peter McKay, John Gliva, Sally Cox, Sheldon Adams, Randy Bates, Gabrielle LaRoche, John Oscar, Carol Smith, Marlene Campbell, Susan Lee, Andy DeValpine, Steve Hanis, Julie Hammonds, Leo Luczak, Susan Round.

PURPOSE:

- Review Plan Evaluation and Plan Amendment Application packets
- Help get you started on your Plan Evaluation

AGENDA:

1. Introduction

Katharine- Agenda & ground rules. Regs signed 5/25; effective 7/1; working w/ OCRM for their approval. Focusing on plan evaluation today. Other questions will be addressed at later teleconferences. Future teleconferences- next Tues. morning @ 9 AM re: walking through evaluation of sample policies. Homework- look at your sample policies & walk at least 1 policy through template. Will also answer any e-mail questions that come up when you're going thru this exercise.

Sara- Coming soon- FAQ page on webpage.

2. Review Packet Materials

Packet 1: Plan Evaluation and attachments:
Packet 2: Application for plan amendment funds.

Plan evaluation due 8/2 @ 2 PM. Tight timeframe but this will allow more time for plan amendments.

3. How To Use Materials

Packet 1- Plan Evaluation materials. Required to apply for Plan Amendment funds. These versions are the refined versions. Available on web.

Benefits of completing an evaluation include:

- Familiarity with the changes to the program;

- Understanding what components of your plan need to be changed;
- Understanding the tasks and costs of updating your plan and,
- Preparation for filling out your Plan Amendment application.

Attachment A-E:

Attachment A: Plan Evaluation Template:

Answer questions in italics.

Need to use the template for the evaluation: must follow format

Reason- so we can quickly review & compare plan evaluations to equitably distribute funds.

Attachment B. Plan Evaluation Guidance (overview of Plan Evaluation process)

Steps 1-3 match sections of template 1-3

1. Analyze your plan
2. Talk to decision makers
3. Decide how to proceed

Step 4 is actually writing up the evaluation: Basically a summary and conclusions of steps 1 -3

1. Analyze plan Attachments C, D and E will assist you in analyzing plan – will get to that

2. Talking to decision makers: we have included a list of topics you should cover- Call if you need assistance/clarification

3. Decide how to proceed- how extensive will your revision be.

What will it take to make the changes as far as resources?

If you look under “talk to your decision makers – options to consider” –several different options available – You may want to focus only a limited area / or certain subject that are especially important to the district – or you may decide you want to task a more comprehensive approach.

Decision will be different for each district – depending on resources (do you already have maps or necessary research available), commitment of staff and administration and what you are starting with.

Attachment C- Element by Element Worksheet. Use to analyze your plan. Will help w/ a-j on plan evaluation template. Ordered on what would make the most sense to go through first. Most focus is on enforceable policies.

Attachment D- Policy Analysis Worksheet Key. Use to analyze your policies. Series of questions to help you decide if the policy meets the new criteria. #8- is it worth it? If yes, then it might be worth it to revise it. If not, you may want to drop it.

Attachment E- Policy Analysis Worksheet. Use to answer policy questions in Attachment D. Keep worksheets for future reference. Attachment D is guide for Attachment E. We don't need to see this for plan evaluation, but it may have future value in making rewriting policies easier.

Packet 2- Application. Plan evaluation main part of application. Two are due together on 8/2 @ 2 PM. Rest of application includes regular info usually due for special projects- project descriptions, milestones, schedules, etc. What's listed is minimum that's in regulations. Back up budget numbers with how you calculated them.

4. How Plan Evaluations Will Be Used

By districts- focus on most important policies. Eliminate those that are unused.
By agencies- to award plan amend \$\$.
Give fair analysis. Amount of funds you receive will depend on extent of a revision.

5. Money

Plan Evaluation- put in required tasks grant. Required tasks grants out today or tomorrow. Would like to have them signed by 7/1. Most got \$2000 & included in grant. How bill out time? We will give \$2000 when plan evaluation handed in. We're paying for product. Up to district on how to bill. Recognize considerable work but only \$2k available.

Plan Amend- review team will meet week of 8/2 to distribute \$. Between \$10k- \$50k available to amend grants. May not be sufficient for your needs but only \$900k to work with. Can take this into consideration in plan evaluation. Other criteria will be used to distribute \$\$- participation, size of district, etc. Award letter by 3rd wk of Aug. (hopefully!). Grant contracts done by end of Aug/ 1st part of Sept.

6. Resources

Website- planner's workpage. Evaluation & plan amendment packet on there. We will continually add to it. If you can think of anything that would be helpful to you, let us know. Enforceable policies are on there in Word doc. GIS protocols will be added. Apply to digital. If maps not digital, may not apply.

Working w/ Ketchikan gateway Borough. Completed plan evaluation & will put up as an example. Will also post worksheets. Submitted preliminary draft parts of plan. We will review policies over next couple of weeks with resource agencies to ground truth policies – to see what policies are acceptable and to provide you with some samples. We hope to have them available after July 1st.

Staff- don't hesitate to call. FAQ will be on workpage.

7. Wrap-Up

Importance of enforceable policies. Next teleconference- would like to walk through some policies. Before next teleconference, please use worksheets for your own policies. Hopefully this will generate questions for the next teleconference. Next teleconference- Tues. (6/15) 9 AM.

Marlene Campbell thanked everyone for helping to understand all the changes, for the guidance, and for grant \$.

Questions: These questions were asked during the teleconference, not necessarily in this order.

Question: Application/ Plan Evaluation due dates: There are different dates listed on the cover sheets of the packets.

Answer: Everything must be **RECIEVED** by DCED by 2:00 pm AKDT on August 2. If you fax or e-mail on 8/2, a signed copy must be by postmarked by 8/3.

Question: Application/ Plan Evaluation due dates: What if the Plan Evaluation isn't done by 8/2? Can it be turned in late?

Answer: Timeframe is so tight that there is no wiggle room. Plus the plan amendment grant application is due 8/2 and the Plan Evaluation is part of the application. Plus we will have an award committee meeting later that week. We will need to know what work everyone is planning on doing so that we can distribute funds accordingly.

Question: Budget: The Project Budget asks for contractual costs. A contract must be done by RFP. We won't know the amount until after the grant is awarded. How can you put number in grant?

Answer: Estimate.

Question: Match: What is the match requirement?

Answer: The match amount is the same as last year - 50% and 18% for CRSAs for required tasks. The \$2,000 for the Plan Evaluation DOES have to be matched since it is under required tasks.

There is NO MATCH for the plan amendment. Additional expenditures on the plan amendment, beyond the grant, can be used as match for required tasks. EXCEPT, CRSA staff time doesn't count as match since it is already being paid w/ grant \$.

Question: **Billing:** \$2000 for Plan Evaluation- how soon can we send the bill to the State?

Answer: We will pay once we get the evaluation. We plan on paying with the 1st quarter report. But if you need the money sooner, send the bill w/ the evaluation.

Question: **CRSA advance:** Will there be a required tasks grant award advance for CRSAs?

Answer: We are trying to get contracts signed by 7/1 & process payment that 1st week.

Question: \$\$\$\$ What is the range of grant award amount?

Answer: \$10,000 – \$50,000.

Question: \$\$\$\$ The Required Task grant award increased by \$2k. Is that for plan evaluation?

Answer: Yes. The Plan Evaluation is part of the required tasks this year.

Question: \$\$\$\$ What if the plan amendment costs more than preliminary estimate?

Answer: We only have a limited amount of funds to distribute and anticipate distributing all available funds for the plan amendments. In the unlikely event that a district doesn't use all of their special project money, we will solicit applications for the unused money to help those districts that may have spent more money than their award amount on their plan amendment.

Question: **Policy analysis:** Do you want to see an analysis of all policies or only ones to be saved?

Answer: Plan evaluation is just a summary of what you want to do. For example, delete 10, keep 5, rewrite 15 policies. Need the following additional maps as back up for some policies. Need additional inventory analysis for others, etc. (Summarize what maps and resources will be necessary and how much effort it will take to acquire them)

Question: **Regs Review:** Will there be a chance to interpret salient reg changes?

Answer: The next teleconference is set up to guide you through the worksheets. Some discussion about regs will come up at that time. Plus on the AMCP website there are track changes versions that show all the changes. We are also working on additional resources for the Planner's Web Workpage, including a flow chart of the transition process. We're also working on training materials that will highlight the salient points of each new standard & how it relates to district policies.

Question: **Attachment B- Talk to Decision Makers.** Our Planning Commission doesn't meet in June/ July. So decision makers are not available. How do we deal with this? Others concurred w/ lack of time to consult w/ decision makers.

Answer: Plan Evaluation is only a planning document. Do the best you can within the time constraints. Real decisions will be made later on during Plan Amendment process.

Question: **Teleconferences:** Will the next one be the same format?

Answer: Yes

Question: **Teleconference:** The policy analysis is scheduled for next week's topic- but my district will be hiring someone to help w/ that part. Wouldn't it be more beneficial to highlight changes in other areas?

Answer: Training materials are being developed to assist with this. For example, information on subject uses & writing new policies for those uses is being developed. It will be helpful to show how enforceable policies flow from subject uses. Guidance is needed on subject uses so that policies can be written. Next teleconference will start with subject uses and flow to enforceable policies.

Question: **Implementation Chapter:** Is OPMP planning on putting together a sample implementation chapter? This will affect amount of work & costs of the plan amendments. There may be procedural areas that may need less customization that would help save districts some time.

Answer: The Ketchikan preliminary draft plan includes an implementation chapter. This will be available as an example. We hope to provide other examples that are more applicable to cities & CRSAs. We will discussed & report back to you at the next teleconference.